	Case 2:06-cv-01621-MJP Document 26 Filed 10/30/07 Page 1 of 3
	ENTERED .
Į	l. /
	OCT 30 2007
02	OC , SEATHER DE
03	CLERN DISTIN
04	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
	AT SEATTLE
05	RYAN ERIC MORRIS,) CASE NO. C06-1621-MJP-MAT
06)
07	Petitioner,)
08	v.) ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S) HABEAS PETITION WITH
	BELINDA STEWART,) PREJUDICE
09	Respondent.
10	<u> </u>
11	
12	This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas action (Dkt.
	Nos. 1 & 16.) Having reviewed the petition for writ of habeas corpus, the Report and
13	Recommendation of Judge Mary Alice Theiler, United States Magistrate Judge and Petitioner's
14	
.15	
16	
	/
17	
18	
19	06-CV-01621-ORD
20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
21	
22	
	ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S

HABEAS PETITION WITH PREJUDICE

PAGE -1

objections¹ thereto, the Court DISMISSES the action with prejudice.

In his habeas petition, Mr. Morris argues three grounds for relief. Mr. Morris failed to exhaust his state remedies on the first two grounds and is now procedurally barred from bringing those claims under RCW 10.73.090. Third, Mr. Morris argues that community confinement constitutes imprisonment and thus his sentence of a 130 month term of confinement and a 24 to 28 month term of community custody exceeded the maximum sentence range. In his objections, Mr. Morris asserts that this Court should hold his habeas action in abeyance until the Washington Supreme Court decides this issue in its review of State v. Tarabochia, 3411-5-II (Wash. App. Div.2, 4/17/2007)².

Mr. Morris previously brought this issue before the Snohomish County Superior Court and it was later dismissed by the Washington Court of Appeals. (Dkt. No. 21, Ex. 15; Dkt. No. 17.) Mr. Morris then filed a motion for discretionary review in the Washington Supreme Court.

The Commissioner denied review, first finding that the petition was barred by the expiration of

The Court construes Petitioner's "Motion for Abeyance" (Dkt. No. 25) as an objection to the Report and Recommendations.

Mr. Morris' reliance on Fetterly v. Paskett, 997 F.2d 1295 (9th Cir. 1993) and Neuschafer v. Whitley, 860 F.2d 1470 (9th Cir. 1988) is in error. In Fetterly, the petitioner discovered new constitutional issues while his habeas petition was pending. 997 F.2d at 1299. The Ninth Circuit held that the trial court erred when it refused to grant the petitioner a stay; the court found that the petitioner should have been allowed to exhaust the newly identified constitutional issues in state court before the federal court reviewed his habeas petition. Id. at 1300. In Neuschafer, the Ninth Circuit found that petitioner did not abuse the writ of habeas corpus when he deliberately withheld certain unexhausted claims from his first petition and that the district court erred in dismissing petitioner's second habeas petition, brought after those claims had been exhausted. Mr. Morris has neither discovered new constitutional issues in his case nor is his petition being denied for abuse of the writ of habeas corpus. Further, Mr. Morris' unexhausted claims are now procedurally barred under RCW 10.73.090.

the one-year statute of limitations under RCW 10.73.090(1), and, in addressing the merits of the 02 state law claim, found that Mr. Morris had received a lawful sentence that was valid on its face. 03 (Dkt. No. 21, Ex. 19 at 1-2.) 04 Because the Commissioner of the Supreme Court found that Mr. Morris' third ground for 05 relief was procedurally barred, Mr. Morris cannot pursue the claim in federal court without 06 demonstrating a fundamental miscarriage of justice, or cause and prejudice. See Coleman v. 07 Thompson, 501 U.S. 722, 735 n.1, 749-50 (1991); Harris v. Reed, 489 U.S. 255, 263 (1989). Mr. 08 Morris' assertion that the Washington Supreme Court will be hearing the case of State v. 09 <u>Tarabochia</u> is not sufficient to overcome the procedural bar. 10 The Court adopts the Report and Recommendations. Petitioner's federal habeas petition 11 (Dkts. No. 1 & 16) is DENIED and this action is DISMISSED with prejudice. 12 13 The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to petitioner, to counsel for respondent, and to Judge Theiler. 14 DATED this 30 day of Och 15 16 17 United States District Judge 18 19 20 21 22

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S HABEAS PETITION WITH PREJUDICE PAGE -3